G. R. S. 59] GPB—1,000 20 12 1.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1894-5
191
(Inward)

File No. //

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Directing that Nilakantappa who is now doing Puja in the Hariharesawaraswamy temple at Harihar should be recognised as the gumasta of Hariyappa. Archaka thereof

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Inward 59-291-5
	" 329-32-1-4.

Note from the Muzrai
Supdt ~~dated~~ on M no 2407
dated 8th July 1894.

A certain hereditary
archak of the Pagoda of
Harcharaswara swami in
Harrur having been found to
be suffering from an incurable
disease, the Muzarai Dept
removed him, & appointed
a stranger in his place.—

The person removed
requests that his grandson,
a minor of 8 years old,
may be appointed as
Huckdar, & one Nelakantha
appointed in his lieu
his grandson attaining
his majority & qualifying
himself for the duties.

The Muzarai Supt

is requested to state
whether Blakemore
is competent to do duties
of the office, or if he is,
what Objections there is
to Petitioner's request being
complied with. —

20/8/94

Supt
11/24/8

Genl Bn

Read letter from the Inspr
Supt of 13th Dec 1894 No 531
1195

Genl do not agree with the Inspr
Supt that Minors should not be
appointed as Baravardars,
because it might be found
difficult to oust them if they
do not qualify themselves for the office
Minors may & should be appointed
as Baravardars on the condition that
they would be allowed to perform the duties
only if they qualify themselves for
the post In the case under notice
~~there is an application by the minor's~~
~~Guardian~~ the Supt is

Requested to
appoint the Inspector
Mylerappa as the
Warrandar & also
Nilkanthappa to do
the duties during
his necessity or until
further orders

10/2195

MYSORE DEWAN'S OI

MUZRAI DEPARTMEN.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 45.

dated 31st January/92 received at the

Dewan's Office from Gere Deshastha
others worshippers of Harihara
Swamy temple
at Harihar, Davangere
Taluk.

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
~~enclosures~~, to the Dy Commr, Chit
Drug Dist, for early
enquiry and disposal
If the matter complained
of is true, a proper
Archick may be selected
and recommended to this
office for appointment

By Order,

583 & 19/2/93

No 387

Official memorandum.

The accompanying Petition no: 611 dated 26th Dec: 92 received at the Dewan's Office from the residents of Harichar, Davanagere Taluk is forwarded to the Deputy Commr., Chitaldrug Distn for enquiry and ~~disposal~~ & report.

B.O.

18-1-93.

draft

Seen

From the Secretariat 5838/32 18/1/93

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN 426 MUZRAI BRANCH

189[illegible]

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~
Government of Mysore

Dated 19th
Despatched 22nd } April 1893.
Received 25

Enclosures No. Records.

General No. 583.
No. 32.

In reply to Official Memorandum
No: 387 dated 26th December
SUBJECT

Reporting upon the petition from the inhabitants of Harihar complaining against one Hariyappa, Archaka of the Harihareswara Swamy Temple at Harihar.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Vide No 238. & 11-96 7/2/96

await further report
at
15/5/93

Deputy Commissioners Office
as. Chitaldrug District
Dated 19th April 1893

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Muzarai Department
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum No 38, dated 26th December last - forwarding for enquiry and report a petition from the inhabitants of Harihar Complaining against one Hariappah, Archik of the Harihareswara Swamy Temple at Harihar, I have the honor to report as follows.-

2 On receipt of your Official Memorandum No 3 dated 9th February 1892 forwarding for disposal a similar petitio

from the people of Harchar, Mr. Ameer Hasan, the then General Assistant Commissioner of this District, was directed to make enquiries and submit a report. In submitting the record of the enquiry held by him on the spot that officer stated that according to the Medical Certificate embodied with this record, Archik — Hariyappa was suffering not from Leprosy but from a Non-Contagious Cutaneous disease, which could be cured in a few months under proper treatment. He further recommended that the Archik might be granted 6 months' leave on the Substitute of one Swamy Raya Thereupon the Amildar of the Savanjiri Taluk was directed to appoint the above named substitute for 6 months and to submit a report on the operation of that period on

to the state of Haricappas-
health. Subsequently the Deputy
Amildar of Haribar, reported
in his No 319 dated the 2nd instan
that Hariyappa Continued to
suffer from the disease mentioned
above and that as he (Hariyappa
failed to produce a Competent
person to do duty and as the
substitute already appointed
was found unfit another man
by name Kanpatti Deekshit
had been appointed on the
recommendation of the Manager
of the Temple to do the duties
of Archik

3. I beg to submit herewith the
entire record with a ferist
attached thereto for perusal
and kind return.

4. Since writing the above I
have received a petition
Complaining against the character
and qualifications of Kanpatti
Deekshet. I have sent the petition
to the Deputy Amildar for enquiry and
early report. I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug

1894

No. 2407

Name of Petitioner. Haringappa, arch
of Harihareswarany & temple

Village. Harihar

Sub Taluk. do

District. Chitaldroog

Date of Art. 8-2-94

Date of Receipt. 12-2-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the Inamdar
Secretary's order no 277, dat
13-10-93 declining to grant his
of entering his grandson's name
the Baraward of archak's shuk de
his post, on the ground's that hi
posts in the enjoyment of hered
ancestors since a very long time
in the same temple many more
hukdars' names are entered i
Baraward & the duties are fixed
their Gumastas, & that by the con
of his present Gumastal no

time
Stamp sufficient

Petr who is an archak of the
Harihar temple says that he
under medical treatment
a skin disease which is
communicable & be cured
and that on recovery he will
resume his duties. In the
meantime he asked the Inamdar
Sptt to register the name
name of his grandson a minor
& permit a Gumasta being
appointed for the minor. That
Inamdar said that the question
entering the grandson's name
the Baraward would be con-
sidered if after he attains majority
is found qualified, and not
on

Petr appeals from that order &
says that there are several
instances of registering the names
minors

Submitted for orders.

9/3

Forwarded to the
Inamdar & Supdt
for their remarks.

6/5/94

says therefore that the Barawaard
ay be made in the name of his
inor grandson Malbarappa
t till his majority the work may
taken by an able Gumasta appoint
him (Cutch)

EIGHT ANNAS

[illegible] Two Rupees Stamp

2407
12-2-94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ه- اسم الفاعل: هو اسم مشتق يدل على الحدث وفاعله. (كاتب - مسافر - ضارب)

صيغ اسم الفاعل كثيرة — أشهرها وزن فاعل — ويأتي من الثلاثي المجرد على وزن فاعل، ومن غير الثلاثي على وزن مضارعه مع إبدال حرف المضارعة ميماً مضمومة وكسر ما قبل الآخر.

أمثلة: كاتب، مسافر، ضارب، مُكرِم، مُستخرِج، مُتعلِّم.

و- اسم المفعول: هو اسم مشتق يدل على الحدث ومفعوله. (مكتوب - مسافر - مضروب)

صيغ اسم المفعول كثيرة — أشهرها وزن مفعول — ويأتي من الثلاثي المجرد على وزن مفعول، ومن غير الثلاثي على وزن مضارعه مع إبدال حرف المضارعة ميماً مضمومة وفتح ما قبل الآخر.

أمثلة: مكتوب، مسافر، مضروب، مُكرَم، مُستخرَج، مُتعلَّم.

ز- اسم المكان: هو اسم مشتق يدل على الحدث ومكانه. (مكتب - مسافر - مضرب)

صيغ اسم المكان كثيرة — أشهرها وزن مفعل — ويأتي من الثلاثي المجرد على وزن مفعل، ومن غير الثلاثي على وزن مضارعه مع إبدال حرف المضارعة ميماً مضمومة وفتح ما قبل الآخر.

أمثلة: مكتب، مسافر، مضرب، مُكرَم، مُستخرَج، مُتعلَّم.

ح- اسم الزمان: هو اسم مشتق يدل على الحدث وزمانه. (مكتب - مسافر - مضرب)

صيغ اسم الزمان كثيرة — أشهرها وزن مفعل — ويأتي من الثلاثي المجرد على وزن مفعل، ومن غير الثلاثي على وزن مضارعه مع إبدال حرف المضارعة ميماً مضمومة وفتح ما قبل الآخر.

أمثلة: مكتب، مسافر، مضرب، مُكرَم، مُستخرَج، مُتعلَّم.

ಕಾಲಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಕೈಮುಗಿದು ಬೇಡಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಅವನು ಕರಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕಲ್ಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವನ ಹೃದಯ ಕಠಿಣವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವನ ಕಣ್ಣುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕರುಣೆಯ ಒಂದು ಹನಿಯೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವನು ಕ್ರೂರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪಾಪಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಧರ್ಮಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಹಂಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲೋಭಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೋಸಗಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುಳ್ಳುಗಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಳ್ಳನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹಿಂಸಕನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕೊಲೆಗಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಭ್ರಷ್ಟನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲಂಚಕೋರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮದ್ಯಪಾನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೂಜುಕೋರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವೇಶ್ಯಾಗಮನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪರಸ್ತ್ರೀಲಂಪಟನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪರಪುರುಷಲಂಪಟೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಲಿಂಗಕಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪಶುಕಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಕಳ್ಳಸಾಗಣೆದಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಾದಕವಸ್ತು ಮಾರಾಟಗಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಸ್ತ್ರಾಸ್ತ್ರ ಮಾರಾಟಗಾರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಭಯೋತ್ಪಾದಕನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ನಕ್ಸಲೀಯನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಾವೋವಾದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕತಾವಾದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕೋಮುವಾದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಾತಿವಾದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮತಾಂಧನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಫ್ಯಾಸಿಸ್ಟನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ನಾಜಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹಿಟ್ಲರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಸೊಲಿನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸ್ಟಾಲಿನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಾವೋನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪೋಲ್ ಪಾಟ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಈದಿ ಅಮೀನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಗಾಬೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸದ್ದಾಂ ಹುಸೇನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗಡಾಫಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬಿನ್ ಲಾಡೆನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಷರಫ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಿಮ್ ಜಾಂಗ್ ಇಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಿಮ್ ಜಾಂಗ್ ಉನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪುಟಿನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬುಷ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಒಬಾಮನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಟ್ರಂಪ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬೈಡೆನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೋದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಮಿತ್ ಶಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯೋಗಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿದ್ದರಾಮಯ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಡಿಕೆಶಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯಡಿಯೂರಪ್ಪನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶೆಟ್ಟರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸವದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಗದೀಶ್ ಶೆಟ್ಟರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಸವದಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಈಶ್ವರಪ್ಪನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅನಂತಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುಷ್ಮಾ ಸ್ವರಾಜ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೇಟ್ಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸೀತಾರಾಮನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗೋಯಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪ್ರಧಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೋಶಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅನುರಾಗ್ ಠಾಕೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸ್ಮೃತಿ ಇರಾನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹೇಮಾ ಮಾಲಿನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಧರ್ಮೇಂದ್ರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಮಿತಾಭ್ ಬಚ್ಚನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಾರುಖ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಲ್ಮಾನ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆಮಿರ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಕ್ಷಯ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಜಯ್ ದೇವಗನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸೈಫ್ ಅಲಿ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹೃತಿಕ್ ರೋಷನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಣಬೀರ್ ಕಪೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಣವೀರ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಾಹಿದ್ ಕಪೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವರುಣ್ ಧವನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಟೈಗರ್ ಶ್ರಾಫ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಾರ್ತಿಕ್ ಆರ್ಯನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆಯುಷ್ಮಾನ್ ಖುರಾನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಾಜ್‌ಕುಮಾರ್ ರಾವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪಂಕಜ್ ತ್ರಿಪಾಠಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ನವಾಜುದ್ದೀನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಿಕಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಇರ್ಫಾನ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಓಂ ಪುರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ನಸೀರುದ್ದೀನ್ ಶಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅನುಪಮ್ ಖೇರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪರೇಶ್ ರಾವಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಕ್ಷಯ್ ಖನ್ನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಂಜಯ್ ದತ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುನೀಲ್ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಾಕಿ ಶ್ರಾಫ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅರ್ಷದ್ ವಾರ್ಸಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬೊಮನ್ ಇರಾನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಬೀರ್ ಬೇಡಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪ್ರೇಮ್ ಚೋಪ್ರಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪ್ರಾಣ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಜಿತ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕಪೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗುಲ್ಶನ್ ಗ್ರೋವರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಕೇಶ್ ರಿಷಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಲೋಕ್‌ನಾಥ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಹೇಶ್ ಮಂಜ್ರೇಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಂಜಯ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಾಕಿರ್ ಹುಸೇನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಮ್ಜದ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಾದರ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಕ್ತಿ ಸಮಂತಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮನೋಜ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಫಿರೋಜ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಿತೇಂದ್ರನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಾಜೇಶ್ ಖನ್ನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶತ್ರುಘ್ನ ಸಿನ್ಹಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವಿನೋದ್ ಖನ್ನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಂಜೀವ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬಲರಾಜ್ ಸಾಹ್ನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುನಿಲ್ ದತ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪೃಥ್ವಿರಾಜ್ ಕಪೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಾಜ್ ಕಪೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ದೇವ್ ಆನಂದ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ದಿಲೀಪ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಶೋಕ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಿಶೋರ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ರಫಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಕೇಶ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮನ್ನಾ ಡೇನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹೇಮಂತ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ತಲತ್ ಮೆಹಮೂದ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿ.ಎಚ್. ಆತ್ಮನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುರೇಂದ್ರ ಕೌರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಮ್ಶಾದ್ ಬೇಗಂನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗೀತಾ ದತ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆಶಾ ಭೋಸ್ಲೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲತಾ ಮಂಗೇಶ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಉಷಾ ಮಂಗೇಶ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೀನಾ ಮಂಗೇಶ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹೃದಯನಾಥ್ ಮಂಗೇಶ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ದೀನಾನಾಥ್ ಮಂಗೇಶ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಚಿನ್ ತೆಂಡೂಲ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುನಿಲ್ ಗವಾಸ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಪಿಲ್ ದೇವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅನಿಲ್ ಕುಂಬ್ಳೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಾಹುಲ್ ದ್ರಾವಿಡ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವಿರಾಟ್ ಕೊಹ್ಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಧೋನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸೌರವ್ ಗಂಗೂಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಹೀರ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹರ್ಭಜನ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯುವರಾಜ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯೂಸುಫ್ ಪಠಾಣ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಇರ್ಫಾನ್ ಪಠಾಣ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುನಾಫ್ ಪಟೇಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆಶೀಷ್ ನೆಹ್ರಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಜಿತ್ ಅಗರ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುರೇಶ್ ರೈನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಂಬಾಟಿ ರಾಯುಡುವಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕೇದಾರ್ ಜಾಧವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಿಖರ್ ಧವನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರೋಹಿತ್ ಶರ್ಮಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕೆ.ಎಲ್. ರಾಹುಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಯಾಂಕ್ ಅಗರ್ವಾಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪೃಥ್ವಿ ಶಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶುಭ್‌ಮನ್ ಗಿಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸೂರ್ಯಕುಮಾರ್ ಯಾದವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಇಶಾನ್ ಕಿಶನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಋತುರಾಜ್ ಗಾಯಕ್‌ವಾಡ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶ್ರೇಯಸ್ ಅಯ್ಯರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ದೀಪಕ್ ಹೂಡಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹಾರ್ದಿಕ್ ಪಾಂಡ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕೃಣಾಲ್ ಪಾಂಡ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವಾಷಿಂಗ್ಟನ್ ಸುಂದರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಕ್ಷರ್ ಪಟೇಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯಜುವೇಂದ್ರ ಚಹಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕುಲದೀಪ್ ಯಾದವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರವಿ ಬಿಷ್ಣೋಯಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಸ್‌ಪ್ರೀತ್ ಬುಮ್ರಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಶಮಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಭುವನೇಶ್ವರ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಸಿರಾಜ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಉಮೇಶ್ ಯಾದವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಇಶಾಂತ್ ಶರ್ಮಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಶಾರ್ದೂಲ್ ಠಾಕೂರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ದೀಪಕ್ ಚಹರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ನವದೀಪ್ ಸೈನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಟಿ. ನಟರಾಜನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಖಲೀಲ್ ಅಹ್ಮದ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮುಕೇಶ್ ಕುಮಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆವೇಶ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅರ್ಷದೀಪ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಯಶ್ ದಯಾಳ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹರ್ಷಲ್ ಪಟೇಲ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೋಫ್ರಾ ಆರ್ಚರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬೆನ್ ಸ್ಟೋಕ್ಸ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೋಸ್ ಬಟ್ಲರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೇಸನ್ ರಾಯ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಲೆಕ್ಸ್ ಹೇಲ್ಸ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಡೇವಿಡ್ ಮಲಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಯೀನ್ ಅಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಆದಿಲ್ ರಶೀದ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಾರ್ಕ್ ವುಡ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕ್ರಿಸ್ ವೋಕ್ಸ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸ್ಯಾಮ್ ಕರನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಟಾಮ್ ಕರನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲಿಯಾಮ್ ಲಿವಿಂಗ್‌ಸ್ಟೋನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಹ್ಯಾರಿ ಬ್ರೂಕ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜೋ ರೂಟ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಲಸ್ಟೇರ್ ಕುಕ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೈಕಲ್ ವಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗ್ರಹಾಂ ಥೋರ್ಪ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಡೆರೆಕ್ ಅಂಡರ್‌ವುಡ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಇಯಾನ್ ಬೋಥಮ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ರಿಚರ್ಡ್ ಹ್ಯಾಡ್ಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಕಪಿಲ್ ದೇವ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಿಂದರ್ ಅಮರನಾಥ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸುನಿಲ್ ಗವಾಸ್ಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸೈಯದ್ ಕಿರ್ಮಾನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಫಾರೂಕ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಜಿತ್ ವಾಡೇಕರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬಿಷನ್ ಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೇಡಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಎರಪಳ್ಳಿ ಪ್ರಸನ್ನನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಬಿ.ಎಸ್. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಲೀಂ ದುರಾನಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಬ್ಬಾಸ್ ಅಲಿ ಬೇಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಚೇತನ್ ಚೌಹಾಣ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮಾಧವ್ ಆಪ್ಟೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಪಾಲಿ ಉಮ್ರಿಗರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ವಿನೂ ಮಂಕಡ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿ.ಕೆ. ನಾಯುಡುವಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿ.ಕೆ. ಖನ್ನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲಾಲಾ ಅಮರನಾಥ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ನಿಸಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಹಾಂಗೀರ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಮರ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೆಹರ್ ಬಾನರ್‌ಜಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿ.ಕೆ. ನಾಯುಡುವಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಸಿ.ಕೆ. ಖನ್ನಾನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಲಾಲಾ ಅಮರನಾಥ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ನಿಸಾರ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಜಹಾಂಗೀರ್ ಖಾನ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಅಮರ್ ಸಿಂಗ್‌ನಾಗಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಮೆಹರ್ ಬಾನರ್‌ಜಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದ.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2407
dated 8-2-94 received at the
Dewan's Office from Hariyappa, Arch
of Hariharesvara Sivam, temp
Harihar, Chitteldroog Dist.
appealing against the Mysore a
Superintendent's order No 2778 of 13-10-93
declining to register the name
of Petitioner's grandson as heir
to his property, late (Petitioner's) pre
former office
is forwarded, together with its 2
enclosures, to the Mysore Superin
tendent for his report
2 The Petition should be
returned with enclosure

By Order,

Council order

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 6/12
1894

Memo

No. 611 of 26th Decr. 92

In December 1892, a petition was received from certain residents of Harihar stating that the ~~appellant~~ Patkar Haraprasad ~~Bhattacharjya~~ who was then an Archak in the Hariharesw Swamy temple at Harihar suffering from leprosy and praying therefore that he mig be removed from office. On t petition being forwarded to the Dy. Commr. of Chitaldroo Distt., for enquiry and rep that Officer reported that the ~~appellant~~ Patkar was suffer from some cutaneous dise which was almost incura and that consequently ano man had been appointed to perform the Puja in th temple.

A copy of the Dep. Dy. Com letter No. 5830/32 on the sub is herewith submitted for reference.

2 ~~The Asst Collr~~ ~~The appellant~~ thereupon presented a petition to the Muz. Supdt stating that the Archakship in question was a hereditary office, long in the enjoyment of his family and praying therefore that the ~~Barawad~~ Baraward of the Service maybe registered in the name of his grandson ~~Ramanna~~ Malharappah a boy 8 years old and another Neelakantappa allowed to perform the Puja as the boy's Gumastah. But as according to Govt Pro No 1926 dt 23rd April/92 issued in the Cir Muz. Deptt, a knowledge of the Agamas is an essential qualification for temple Archakships & the ~~appellant~~ was informed that ~~the question of~~ his prayer could not be granted at present and that it would be taken into consideration when his grandson attains majority and qualifies himself

~~Against the above order.~~

No. 353 of 11th Oct 2/93

that during his minori

and the ~~appellants~~ grandson being a boy of 8 years, could not possess the req? qualifications in this respect


Menco for orders

Pol
No. 1840.

763

MYSORE DEWÄN'S OFFICE, C H

PETITION DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2407
dated 8th February 1894 received at the
Dewan's Office from Hariyappa, Archak
of Harihareswaraswamy
temple, Harihar, Chitaldrug
District appealing against
the Mozrai Superintendent's
order No. 277 & 13th October 1893
declining to register the
name of petitioner's grandson
as Archakar to his post
is forwarded, together with its 2
enclosures, to the Mozrai Superintendent
for his remarks.
2 The petition should
be returned with enclosures

Remarks by the Mozrai Superintendent

In December 1892, a petition
was received from certain residents
of Harihar stating that the Petitioner
Hariappah who was then an
Archak in the Hariharaswaraswami
temple at Harihar was suffering
from leprosy and praying
therefore that he might be removed
from office. On the petition being
forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner,

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 6th
March 1894

M. C. C. P. Bangalore—17-11-94—5,000.

of Chitaldrug District, for enquiry and report, reported that the petitioner was suffering from some disease which was almost incurable and that another man had been appointed to perform the Puja in the Temple.

2. Hariappah thereupon presented a petition to the Mysore Superintendent stating that the Archakship in question was a hereditary Office, long in the enjoyment of his family and praying therefore that the Baraward of the Service maybe registered in the name of his grandson — Malharappah, a boy 8 years old and that during his minority another Mallikarjunappah allowed to perform the Puja as the boy's Gunastha Pant as according to Government Pro. No. 119-2 cir, Dated 23rd April 1892 issued in the Mysore department, a knowledge of the Agamas (Pancharatra) is an essential qualification for temple Archakship and the petitioner's grandson being a boy of 8 years could not possess the required qualifications in this respect, his prayer could not be granted at present and that it would be taken into consideration when his grandson attains majority and qualifies himself for the Archakship.

Superintendent.

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

1894.

MUZARAI.

From The Supdt

To The Ch. Secretary to the Diwan

Dated 31st

Despatched 1st July 1894 August

Received

Enclosures No. 4

General No. 95

Muzarai F. No. 11-94

His Official Memo No Pet. 1840 of 6th May Encl forwarding for the Govr. Supt's remarks a petn No. 2407 of 8th Feb.y 94 from Hanialu Archak of the Hari Laxmanarasimha Temple in Harihar

Requesting the above, has the honor

1. Attn. the official memo with the undersigned's remarks ~~on the subject~~ recorded thereon

2. The enclosures to the official memo under reply are herewith ret'd.

A/S

GOVERNMENT Gen. Serial No. 30.]

Subd b Council
21/7/8

Put up copy
& also quote
& the Magam
Deptt ... b
handed up
in 1892 Coll
11/8

To
The Muzrai Department
Please put up the above
references.
Rad
17/8/94.

1894. 1384
MUZARAI. P.L. 76

From The Superintendent of
in Ellysore

To The Chief Secretary to th
Dewan of

Dated 31st July
Despatched 1st August
Received

Enclosures No. 4

General No. 95
Muzarai F. No. 11-94.

His Official Memorandum No. Pol. 1840 dated 6th May 1894, forwardin for the Muzrai Superintendent's remarks a petition No. 2407 dated 8th February 1894, from Hariappa, Archa of the Harihareswaraswamy Temple in Harihar.

Adverting to the above, has the honor to return the Official Memorandum with the undersigned's remark recorded thereon.

2. The enclosures to the Official Memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

Superintendent
C.V.

Rec'd 3/8
Govt Branch
2/8/94

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read.

Note from the Muzaraji
Superintendent on Petition —
registered No. 2407 dated 8th February
1894.

order thereon No. 3596 / Pet 327
Dy 22-8-94 / 31.

A certain hereditary Archak
of the Pagoda of Haribareswara
Swami in Haribar having been
found to be suffering from
an incurable disease, the
Muzaraji Department removed
him, and appointed a stranger
in his place.

The person removed requests
that his grandson, a minor of
8 years old, may be registered
as Archakdar, and one —
Nilakantappa, appointed in
lieu till his grandson attains

his majority, and qualifies himself for the duties.

2. The Muzaraji Superintendent is requested to state whether Vilakantappa is competent to do duties of the office, and if he is, what objection there is to Petitioner's request being complied with

Draft immediate order) 21-8-96

Dy Chief Secretary

To

The Muzaraji Superintendent

BK 2872

OFFICE OF
124
MU
BRANCH
DEWAN OF MYSORE

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894-95

From The Chief Secretary

To The Muzrai Superintendent

Dated 22

Despatched 31 August 1894

Received 31/8

Enclosures No.

General No. 3596

~~*Muzarayi.* B.~~ ~~M.~~ 327

Requesting to state whether Nilakantappa is competent to do duties of ~~the office of~~ Archak in the Harihareswara swamy Temple at Harihar

To D.C Chitaldrug No 238 dt 1/9/94.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore

Read :-

Note from the Muzrai Superintendent on petition registered No 2407 dated 8th February 1894.

Order thereon

No. 3596 / Pet: 327. dated Bangalore 22nd - 31 August 1894

A certain hereditary archak of the Pagoda of Harihareswaraswami in Harihar having been found to be suffering from an incurable disease, the Muzrai Department removed him, and appointed a stranger in his place.

2. The person removed requests that his grandson, a minor of 8 years old, may be registered as hakdar, and one Nilakantappa appointed in lieu till his grandson attains his majority and qualifies himself for the duties.

3. The Muzrai Superintendent is requested to state whether Nilakantappa is competent to do duties of the Office, and if he is, what objection there is to petitioners' request being complied with.

Chief Secretary

mvp C.V.R.

To
The Muzrai Superintendent

wd

rial No. 30.]

MUZARAI.

1894.

From The Secretary to the Dewan

To

The Dy. Collr. Chittoor Dt.

Dated 18th

Despatched 18th Septr 94

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2388

Muzarai F. No.

Who is the person now doing duty as Archak in the temple in question? When, by whom & under what circs. was the present incumbent appointed? Report.

01

With reference to the 4th para of the letter from the Collr. of Chittoor No 2407 dt. 8th Feb. 94 forwarding a petition from one Hariappa Archak of Harihareswara Swamy temple in Hanhar praying that the hereditary ward of the Archakship held by him may be registered in the name of his grandson a minor named Mallappa & that another Archaka may be allowed to perform Service Puja

From the same No 2407 dt 25-9-94

by the boy's Jumastah
by the latter missing
has the honour to
request submission
of [redacted] information
on the following points
so the same is required
for the disposal of the
petn. in question:-

(1) Who is the boy
Mallanagappa whose
nomination is prayed
for by the Haniabba?
What is the actual
relationship exists
between them?

2) Who is the person
Vilakantappa whom
the petr. Hanimappa
wishes to nominate
as the Jumastah?
How is he related to
the petr.? Is he well
versed in the Agamas
and Tantric worship &
and otherwise qualified, by Character &c to be
the Archak? Is he a member of the

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

190

1894-95

MUZARAI.

From The Deputy Commissioner Chitaldroog district

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Muzarai Departt.

Dated 25th September 1894

Despatched

Received 1/10

Enclosures No. 4

General No. 247

~~Muzarai F. No.~~ 11

Furnishing information regarding Archakship of Hariharesvaraswamy Temple at Harihar

To Ch: Secy No 567 11-94 8/13/10/94

Deputy Chitaldroog

Dated 25th September 1894

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Mmrai Deptt.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 238/11.94 dated the 1st Instant, calling for certain information regarding Archikship of Hariharesvaraswamy temple at Harih I have the honor to submit a report with its accompaniments from the Amildar containing answers to all the questions raised.

(1) Mallharappa whose nomination is prayed for by Hariyappa is reported to be daughter's son of Hariyappa.

(2) Neelakantappa whom Hariappa wants to appoint as Mallharappa's Gumasta is Hariappa's brother-in-law, being the son of Hariappa's father-in-law by his second wife. Neelakantappa is reported to

properly qualified for the Archikship being well conversant with Agamas and worship &c. He is now doing the duties of Archik having been appointed as per Inwra Superinbendents Rubkari No. 190 dated 20th September 1893 But Hariappa has now deposed before the Amildar that the said Neelakantappa is not on good terms with him and that his appointment as Gumasta is likely to be prejudecial to the interests of the Minor Mallharappa. Hariappa further requests that he may be permitted to appoint another Gumasta duly qualified in all respects to perform the duties Archik. Neelankantappa

Renuse stated in his deposition
that he is not willing to continue
to officiate as Archik if his ap-
hointment is not made a
hakka one.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
(Sd) C. Sreenivasiengar
Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

(General Serial No. 30.) 190

1894.95

From The Deputy Commissioner Chitaldroog District

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Immigrai Department

Dated 25th September 1894.

Despatched

Received 1-10-94

Enclosures No. 4.

General No. 247-
No. 71-

Furnishing information regarding Archakships of Harihareswara Swami Temple at Harihar.

247. 11- Enc: 4.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldroog district
Dated 25th September 1894.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Munzavi department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 238 11-94 dated the 1st instant, calling for certain information regarding Archakship of Kanikareswara swamy Temple at Kanikan, I have the honour to submit a report with its accompaniments from the Amildar containing answers to all the questions raised.

(1) Mallhanappa whose nomination is prayed for by Kanijappa is reported to be the daughter's son of Kanijappa

(2) Neelakantappa whom Kanijappa wanted to appoint as Mallhanappa's Sumasta is Kanijappa's brother in law being the son of Kanijappa's father in law by his second wife. Neelakantappa is reported

reported to be properly qualified
for the Archick ship being
well conversant with Agamas
and worship &c. He is now
doing the duties of Archick
having been appointed as per
Huzoor Superintendents
Rubkari No. 190 dated 20th
September 1893. But Hanumappa
has now deposed before the
Amildar that the said Neela-
Kantappa is not on good
terms with him and that his
appointment as Sumaota is
likely to be prejudicial to the
interests of the Minor Mallharappa
Hanumappa further requests
that he may be permitted
appoint another Sumaota
duly qualified in all respects
to perform the duties of Archick
Neelakantappa has likewise
stated in his deposition that
he is not willing to continue
to officiate as Archick if

his

his appointment is not ma
a pakka one.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servt
[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

Collet

1894

551 / 87 13/14 / 12/94.
27 11-94

Encl.

From

The Superintendent of
Mudrai, in Mysore

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to the last Para of the Govt. Bo. No. 3596/P&327 dated 22nd August 1894 in the matter of the appeal Petn. of one Hariappa late Archak of the Hariharesvaraswami Temple at Harihar, I have the honor to observe as follows:—

The person Nilakantaiah whom the ~~writer~~ petitioner Hariappa wishes to be nominated as his minor grandson's gurunatha is the present Archak of the Temple.

2 During my inspection in August 1893, the Devasthanam
the place [illegible]

that the
Shouldbe
Archakship as he had
some incurable cutaneous
disease which rendered him
unfit ~~to perform the Duty~~ to perform in
the Temple. The petitioner
was accordingly removed from
Office; and, when asked at
the time whom he would
like the Office should be given
to, Hariappa stated that he
had no sons ~~himself~~ & prays
therefore that the Office might
be given to his brother-in-law
Nilakantappa. Nilakantapp
was then a School-master
in Harihar. As, however,
on local enquiry it was
ascertained that he was
well versed in the Agama

~~right to~~, his nomination
Archakship as prayed for
by the petitioner Hariappa, was
sanctioned, subject to the condition
that he (Nilakantappa) should
resign the Schoolmastership &
devote himself entirely to the
temple services. Accordingly
Nilakantappa was appointed
to the archakship formerly held
by the petitioner.

Subsequently the petitioner
Hariappa changed his mind
and petitioned, praying that
the Baravard of the archakship
might be registered in the name
of his grandson (daughter's son)
Allyarappa, a minor, his
brother-in-law Nilakantappa
who had already been appointed
to the office, being regarded as the
minor's guardian

I also beg to submit Government
information of the C
letter No. 247/11 Dy 25th Sept: 94
since received from the
Dy Commr: Chitaldrug Distt
together with its 3 enclosures
viz, (1) Kanarese Statement ~~of~~
dated 9th September 1894
given by the petitioner Haviappa
~~before the Dy Amildar of Hiriyur~~,
(2) a ~~Kanarese~~ of the same date
Statement given
by Nilakantappa
~~before the Dy Amildar~~
(3) Kanarese Report No. 178/3 Dy
9th Sept: 1894 submitted by the
Dy Amildar to the Dt Chitaldroog.

As regards the petitioners
Haviappas' request to register the
name of his minor grandson
as Hakdar for the Archakship
in question, I beg to state that if
the prayer be granted it will be
inconsistent with the Orders
issued from time to time
by the Revenue
Department prohibiting the
Revenue

registry in the Barawari of
unqualified minors as
Hakdars for the post during
their minority. My great
objection to such entertainment
of minors is that it is ~~[illegible]~~ found difficult to oust
them from office in case
they should prove incompetent
for the offices for which they have
been registered as Hakdars.
The hereditary character of
such Offices as Temple Archakship
can be conceded only so far
as to give preference in filling
up Vacancies to the members
of the last incumbents' family
if they are found duly qualified
for the Offices in question.
To go beyond this will be
highly prejudicial to the
[illegible]

particular
under reference, however, I
add that the person Ni
who is now doing Puja in the
maybe recognized as the Guru
of the petitioner Hariappa
so long as the latter is alive
though incapacitated for wo

The question of ~~reference~~ appointing
the petitioner's minor grandso
~~as Pujari~~ for the Office
~~should~~ be reserved for conside
~~either~~ after the petitioner's dem
or after the minor attain
majority & duly & qualifie
himself for the Office.

~~Regarding the question~~
~~of appointing the pet's~~
grandson to the archak-
ship for consideration
either after the
pet's demise
or after the ~~minor~~
minor attains
majority & duly
qualifies himself

A

In conclusion I beg to add that from the concluding part of the Dy Com's letter above referred to, it will appear that the pet. has [illegible] [illegible], since the presentation of his appeal [illegible] under [illegible], and does now wishes to appoint another man [illegible] [illegible] But this he cannot be allowed to do [illegible] Nilakanta the first was appointed to the office only on the express application of the pet. to that effect, and further he had to give up the School master's pay formerly held by him on the [illegible]

nd work in the Temple
ne well reported
pon by the Bd Lans &c.
~~is doc and book~~
it is not desirable
to remove him
om the arch[illegible] ~~Bldg~~
~~but to substitute~~
~~the [illegible] Portable~~

Subd

Revised Draft.

Aug. 12/12/94.

D Council

12/17/12

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 . 7788

From The Munsif Pet: 35-8
Superintendent.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 13th December 1894

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 4

General No. 551
No. 11-94

Making certain observations in the matter of the appeal petition of one Harrisappa late Archa of the Haribareswara Swamy Temple at Harib

P

References to be marked.

Given for Petn 1610 of 94

HS
11/12

M. G. C. Press, Bangalore.—3-2 91—3000.

No. 551 Enclosure
mar 57-11-94

Office of the Superintendent
of Mysore, in Mysore
Dated Bangalore 13th December 1894
14

From

The Superintendent of Mysore
in Mysore

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir

With reference to the last para of the Government Proceedings No. 3596 / Pet 327 dated 22nd August 1894, in the matter of the appeal petition of one Hariappa, late Archak of the Harihareswara Swami Temple at Harihar, I have the honor to observe as follows:—

The person Nilakantapah, whom the petitioner Hariappa wishes to be nominated as his minor grandsons' Gumasta, is the present Archak of the Temple.

2. During my inspection of the Temple in August 1893, the devotees of the place represented to me, that the petitioner Hariapah should be removed from the Archakship as he had contracted some incurable cutaneous disease, which rendered him unfit to worship in the Temple. The petitioner was accordingly removed from office; and when asked at the time whom he would like the office should be given to,

Name.

Hariappa stated that he had no sons and prayed therefore that the office might be given to his brother-in-law Nilakantapah. Nilakantapah was then a School-master in Harihar. As, however, on local enquiry it was ascertained that he was well versed in the Agamaic worship, his nomination to the Archakship as prayed for by the petitioner Hariapah, was sanctioned subject to the condition that he (Nilakantapah) should resign the School-mastership and devote himself entirely to the Temple services. Accordingly, Nilakantapah was appointed to the Archakship formerly held by the petitioner.

3. Subsequently, the petitioner Hariapah changed his mind and petitioned, praying that the Baravard of the Archakship might be registered in the name of his grandson (daughter's son) Mylarapa a minor, his brother-in-law Nilakantapah, who had already been appointed to the office, being regarded as the minor's Gumasta. In this connection I also beg to submit herewith for the information of the Government, letter No. 247/11 dated 25th September 894, since received from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug district, together with its 3 enclosures viz, (1) Kanarese Statement dated 9th September 894, given by the petitioner Hariapah, (2) a Statement of the same date given by Nilakantapah, present

worshipper

worshipper and (3) Kanarese report No. 178/3 dated 9th September 1894, submitted by the Deputy Amildar, to the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldrug District.

4. As regards the petitioner Hariapah's request to register the name of his minor grandson as Hakdar for the Archakship in question, I beg to state that, if this prayer be granted, it will be inconsistent with the orders issued, from time to time in the Muzrai Department, prohibiting the registry in the Baravard of unqualified minors as Hakdars for the post during their minority. My great objection to such entertainment of minors is, that it is often found difficult to oust them from office in case they should prove incompetent for the offices for which they have been registered as Hakdars. The hereditary character of such office as Temple Archakship can be conceded only so far as to give preference in filling up vacancies to the members of the last incumbents' family, if they are found duly qualified for the office in question. To go beyond this, will be highly prejudicial to the efficiency of the Temple service.

5 In the particular case under reference, however, I may add that the person Nilakantapah, who is now doing Puja in the Temple, may be recognized as the Gumasta of the petitioner Hariappah himself, so long as the latter is alive though incapacitated for work,

reserving the question of appointing the petitioner's grandson to the Archakship which may be renewed for due consideration by either after the petitioner's demise, or when the minor attains majority and duly qualifies himself for the Office.

~~In conclusion, I beg to add that,~~ From the concluding part of the Deputy Commissioner's letter above read, it would appear that the petitioner Hariapah has fallen out with Nilakantapah, since the presentation of his appeal to the Government, and now wishes to appoint another man in his place. But this we cannot be permitted to do. Nilakantapah was first appointed to the Office only on the express application of the petitioner to that effect, and on that account Nilakantapah had to give up the School mastership formerly held by him. As Nilakantapa's qualification and work in the Temple are well reported upon by the Deputy Commissioner, it is not desirable to remove him from the Archakship in question, though - which we should endeavour to hold as - Hariappa's grandson on the terms of the proceedings para - -

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

A Sreenivasa Rao
Superintendent

1895
Murasaki.

Read :—.

Appeal Petition no. 240 7 d 7 8th Feb.y 1894 from one Haniappa of Hanihar, Against the Murasaki Supt's order no 277 d 13th Oct.r 1893 declining to register the name of the pet.rs grandson As hakdar to the Archakship held by the pet.r in the Hanharaeswara Swami Temple at Hanihar, Chitteldrug Dt.

Correspondence on the above ending with Letter no 247 d 25th Sept.r 1894 from the Dy Com.r

has fallen out with Nilakantappa, since the presentation of his Appeal to the Govt, and now wishes to appoint another man in his place. But this, he can not be permitted to do. Nilakantappa was first appointed to the office only on the express application of the Petr to that effect and on that account, Nilakantappa had to hire up the School Master-Ship formerly held by him. As Nilakantappa's qualification and work in the temple are well reported upon by the Dy Com[r], it is not desirable to remove him from the Archak-Ship in question which he shd continue to hold on the terms of the preceding para-

Sd/ [illegible]

To The Board of Chrl. Endowments
Vr. Papers

READ:—

Appeal Petition No. 2407, dated 8th February 1894, from one Hariyappa of Harihar, against the Muzrai Superintendent's Order No. 277, dated 13th October 1893, declining to register the name of the petitioner's grandson as *Hakdar* to the Archakship held by the petitioner in the Harihareswaraswami temple at Harihar, Chitaldroog District.

Correspondence on the above, ending with letter No. 247-11, dated 25th September 1894, from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District.

READ ALSO:—

The following extract from the Muzrai Superintendent's letter to the Chief Secretary to the Dewan, No. 551, dated 13th December 1894:—

"With reference to the last para of the Government Proceedings No. 8596—Pet. 327, dated 22nd August 1894, in the matter of the appeal petition of one Hariyappa, late Archak of the Harihareswaraswami temple at Harihar, I have the honor to observe as follows:—

"The person Nilakantappa, whom the petitioner Hariyappa wishes to be nominated as his minor grandson's Gumasta, is the present Archak of the temple.

2. "During my inspection of the temple in August 1893, the devotees of the place represented to me that the petitioner Hariyappa should be removed from the Archakship, as he had contracted some incurable cutaneous disease which rendered him unfit to worship in the temple The petitioner was accordingly removed from office and when asked at the time whom he would like the office should be given to, Hariyappa stated that he had no sons and prayed therefore that the office might be given to his brother-in-law Nilakantappa. Nilakantappa was then a School Master in Harihar. As however, on local enquiry it was ascertained that he was well versed in the Agamaic worship, his nomination to the Archakship as prayed for by the petitioner Hariyappa was sanctioned, subject to the condition that he (Nilakantappa) should resign the School Mastership and devote himself entirely to the temple services. Accordingly Nilakantappa was appointed to the Archakship formerly held by the petitioner.

3. "Subsequently, the petitioner Hariyappa changed his mind and petitioned praying that the Baravard of the Archakship might be registered in the name of his grandson (daughter's son) Mylarappa, a minor, his brother-in-law Nilakantappa who had already been appointed to the office being regarded as the minor's Gumasta. In this connection I also beg to submit herewith for the information of the Government, letter No. 247-11, dated 25th September 1894, since received from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District, together with its 3 enclosures, *viz*, (1) Kanarese statement dated 9th September 1894, given by the petitioner Hariyappa, (2) a statement of the same date given by Nilakantappa, present worshipper, and (3) Kanarese report No. 178-3, dated 9th September 1894, submitted by the Deputy Amildar, to the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldroog District.

4. "As regards the petitioner Hariyappa's request to register the name of his minor grandson as *Hakdar* for the Archakship in question, I beg to state that, if this prayer be granted, it will be inconsistent with the orders issued from time to time in the Muzrai Department, prohibiting the registry in the Baravard of unqualified minors as Hakdars for the post during their minority. My great objection to such entertainment of minors is, that it is often found difficult to oust them from office in case they should prove incompetent for the offices for which they have been registered as Hakdars. The hereditary character of such office as temple Archakship can be conceded only so far as to give preference in filling up vacancies to the members of the last incumbent's family, if they are found duly qualified for the office in question. To go beyond this will be highly prejudicial to the efficiency of the temple service."

No. 884—MUZ. F. 11-94, DATED BANGALORE, 29TH MARCH 1895.

ORDER THEREON.—Having given the subject their best consideration, the Government are of opinion that Nilakantappa who is now doing Puja in the temple should be recognised as the Gumasta of the petitioner Hariyappa himself, so long as the latter is alive though incapacitated for work. The question of appointing the petitioner's grandson to the Archakship will be reserved for due consideration hereafter, either upon the petitioner's demise, or upon the minor attaining majority and duly qualifying himself for the office.

2. From the concluding part of the Deputy Commissioner's letter above read, it would appear that the petitioner Hariyappa has fallen out with Nilakantappa, since the presentation of his appeal to the Government, and now wishes to appoint another man in his place. But this he cannot be permitted to do. Nilakantappa was first appointed to the office only on the express application of the petitioner to that effect, and on that account Nilakantappa had to give up the School Mastership formerly held by him. As Nilakantappa's qualification and work in the temple are well reported upon by the Deputy Commissioner, it is not desirable to remove him from the Archakship in question, which he should continue to hold on the terms of the preceding para.

Secretary.

To.—The Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District, returning Vernacular Papers.

Exd.—K.S.

1894-95

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 29th March 1895

884
Muz. F. 11

Directing that Nilakantappa, who is n doing Puja in the Haribareswarsaw temple at Haribar, should be recognised the Gumasta of Hariyappa, the Archak the temple, and that the question of pointing his grandson as Archak be reserv for future consideration.

M.G.C.P.B.—18-4-95—120